



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING


RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

July 22, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Presentation of the Revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score

The Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act requires that each state establish criteria and identify and assist teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. States must also report annually to the United States Department of Education a statement of its procedure, along with a list of low-performing and at-risk teacher preparation institutions.

In the spring of 2012, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) created a cross departmental committee to focus on educator effectiveness in order to improve the systems impacting educator preparation and to ensure the state's programs continue to advance in quality. A sub-committee was formed to focus specifically on the development of a revised Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score. The sub-committee utilized the MDE and the State Board of Education's (SBE) priorities to focus the work. The team examined the entire score, as well as the metrics used for assessing the EPIs.

The sub-committee developed three primary goals to provide greater focus for EPIs and align the score more closely to priorities. Attachment A contains the goals which include seven measureable sub-elements or factors that are tightly aligned to the newly approved Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards. Attachment B provides an explanation of the data sources and measurement tools used for data collection.

The Office of Professional Preparation Services is pleased to present information on the Revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score to the State Board of Education.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT
DANIEL VARNER – SECRETARY • RICHARD ZEILE – TREASURER
MICHELLE FECTEAU – NASBE DELEGATE • LUPE RAMOS-MONTIGNY
KATHLEEN N. STRAUS • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

**The Revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution
Performance Score Goals and Factors**

The 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score is organized around three main goals. Goal 1 is divided into two sub-goals indicated with an "A" and a "B". Each goal has a numbered set of sub-elements that indicate what will actually be measured and includes an identification of the tool(s) used to collect the data. Additional information about the tools is included in Attachment B.

Goal #1: Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.

- A. Exposure to and Demonstration of Content Knowledge and Content Specific Pedagogy
 - 1. Content - Michigan Test for Teacher Certification
 - 2. High-Quality Learning Experiences - Evidence Supported Annual Report (ESAR) and Survey
 - 3. Critical Thinking - ESAR and Survey
 - 4. Connect Real World Problems and Local and Global issues - ESAR and Survey
- B. Exposure to and Demonstration of General Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
 - 1. Technology - ESAR and Survey
 - 2. Special Populations - ESAR and Survey
 - 3. Learning Environments - ESAR and Survey
 - 4. Effective Use of Data - ESAR and Survey

Goal #2: Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrate continuous improvement related to Michigan Department Education (MDE) specific priorities.

- 1. Candidate Diversity (recruit, support and retain underrepresented students) - ESAR
- 2. Commitment to Clinical Preparation - ESAR and Survey
- 3. State Evaluation System (flexible options in evaluation design) - ESAR
- 4. Placement Rates in "shortage" areas (including support and advising of candidates in relation to "shortage" areas) - Register of Education Personnel (REP), Michigan Online Educator Certification System (MOECS), and ESAR

Goal #3: Graduates meet standards for effectiveness.

- 1. Ensure that candidates demonstrate effectiveness - REP, MOECS, and Center for Educational Performance Information (CEPI)
- 2. Placement Rates - REP, MOECS and ESAR

In April 2013, MDE staff presented the elements of the draft score to stakeholders from all EPIs. In addition to the April presentation, during the month of May the

MDE hosted four focus groups to garner critical feedback on various elements within the score, the evaluation tools and the score weighting. The next steps in this project include:

- Finalization and dissemination of the EPI Performance Score weighting and metrics.
- Technical assistance to institutions regarding the score and submission of information to MDE.
- Implementation of the score elements with a release of the 2014 EPI Performance Score using the new metrics in the Spring 2014.

Education Preparation Institution Performance Score Metrics

Registry of Education Personnel

- Teacher Effectiveness scores
- Program placement data

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification

- Subject area assessment results

Evidence Supported Annual Report

The ESAR is a narrative report submitted to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) from each Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) as part of the metrics necessary to calculate the annual Performance Score. The ESAR:

- Is an annual measure to be used in-between the 2-7 year accreditation visits
- Is an opportunity for the EPI to provide evidence, in a comprehensive manner, how it is meeting or exceeding the metrics identified by MDE
- Will be revised and resubmit annually
- Responds to specific metrics identified by MDE
- Adheres to strict page limits
- Requires that all narrative must be supported by evidence (data)
- Will undergo a rigorous peer review and rating process
- Utilizes a point-based rating system that will be transparent to the EPIs
- Will require significant attention from the EPIs

Survey Data

- Teacher surveys are expanded to include initial graduates and one year after graduation.
- Perception data are collected from teachers, supervising teachers and principals
- Surveys are revised to align to the newly adopted MI-InTASC standards